

Application No. 10/071,933  
Amendment "B" dated September 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed May 4, 2005

### REMARKS

These remarks and the accompanying amendments are response to the Office Action dated May 4, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as the "Office Action"), having a shortened statutory period for response that expired August 4, 2005. A petition and fee for a one month extension of time accompanies this response thereby extending the period for response until September 5, 2005. Claims 1-40 were pending at the time of the last examination. Claims 1-17 and 33-39 were withdrawn from consideration due an election made in response to a prior restriction requirement. These withdrawn claims are formally cancelled by this response, since they are withdrawn from consideration. Furthermore, Claims 18-20, 27, 28, 31, 32 and 40 are cancelled herein. New claims 41-48 are added. Accordingly, upon entry of this amendment, Claims 21-26, 29, 30, and 41-48 will be pending for further consideration.

Section 2 of the Office Action rejects Claims 18-20, 23-32 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) as being anticipated by United States patent number 6,463,284 issued to Nakamura et al. (hereinafter "Nakamura"). This rejection is moot with respect to cancelled Claims 18-20, 27, 28, 31, 32 and 40, but remains with respect to Claims 23-26, 29 and 30.

Claim 23 recites that "when the switching station receives, after deleting one of pieces of subscriber service information presently registered in the first management unit for use with the switching station, a call origination signal from a mobile station corresponding to the deleted subscriber service information, the switching station acquires the subscriber service information about the mobile station from the second management unit, and, if the acquired subscriber service information cannot be newly registered in the first management unit for use with the switching station, the switching station deletes one of pieces of subscriber service information

Application No. 10/071,933  
Amendment "B" dated September 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed May 4, 2005

presently registered in the first management unit, and registers the acquired subscriber service information in the first management unit for use with the switching station" (emphasis added).

The Office Action asserts that claim 23 is anticipated in light of Nakamura by referring to column 1, line 64 to column 2, line 10, and column 7, lines 13-16 and 35-52 of Nakamura. However, neither column 1, line 64 to column 2, line 10, nor column 7, lines 13-16 nor 35-52 of Nakamura discloses a process in which a call origination signal is received. Column 7, lines 13-16 and 35-52 of Nakamura et al. explains the flow of the location registration process of Figure 2.

Therefore, Claim 23 is not anticipated by Nakamura. These features are not taught or suggested by United States patent number 6,804,540 issued to Shepherd et al. either (hereinafter referred to as "Shepherd"). Claim 43 recites similar features as does Claim 23, and thus is not anticipated by Nakamura, not rendered unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Shepherd. Claims 24 and 43 depend from respective Claims 23 and 43, and are thus not anticipate nor rendered unpatentable over Nakamura and Shepherd, either singly or in combination.

Claim 25 recites that "when the switching station receives, after deleting one of pieces of subscriber service information presently registered in the first management unit for use with the switching station, a call termination signal to a mobile station corresponding to the deleted subscriber service information, the switching station acquires the subscriber service information about the mobile station from the second management unit, and, if the acquired subscriber service information cannot be newly registered in the first management unit for use with the switching station, the switching station deletes one of pieces of subscriber service information presently registered in the first management unit, and registers the acquired subscriber service information in the first management unit for use with the switching station" (emphasis added).

Application No. 10/071,933  
Amendment "B" dated September 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed May 4, 2005

The Office Action asserts that claim 25 is anticipated by Nakamura by referring to column 1, line 64 to column 2, line 10, and column 7, lines 13-16 and 35-52. However, neither column 1, line 64 to column 2, line 10, nor column 7, lines 13-16 nor 35-52 of Nakamura discloses a process when a call termination signal is received. Column 7, lines 13-16 and 35-52 of Nakamura et al. explains the flow of the location registration process of Figure 2.

Therefore, the feature of claim 25 is not anticipated by Nakamura. Shepherd also does not disclose this feature. Claim 45 recites similar features as does Claim 25, and thus is not anticipated by Nakamura, not rendered unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Shepherd. Claims 26 and 46 depend from respective Claims 25 and 45, and are thus not anticipated nor rendered unpatentable over Nakamura and Shepherd, either singly or in combination.

Claim 29 recites that the "switching station selects, as the mobile station whose subscriber service information is to be deleted, a mobile station which has made neither call origination nor call termination during the longest time period till the present time" (emphasis added in a case where "no subscriber service information can be newly registered in the first management unit provided for use with the switching station" (emphasis added)).

The Office action asserts that claim 29 is anticipated by Nakamura by referring to column 4, lines 36-46, and column 7, lines 13-16 and 35-52 of Nakamura. In column 4, lines 36-46 of Nakamura, there is description that whether subscriber data is kept or not is decided based on priority, when the power down of the mobile station, or the completion of the call by the mobile station occurs. However, this is not the decision made at the time when there is no area for registration, and a mobile station whose subscriber service information is to be deleted is selected. As for column 7, lines 13-16 and 35-52 of Nakamura, there is only description that a

Application No. 10/071,933  
Amendment "13" dated September 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed May 4, 2005

mobile station whose subscriber data is to be replaced is selected based on whether the mobile station is on the phone or not (column 7, line 46-51).

Therefore, Claim 29 is not anticipated by Nakamura. This feature is also not taught or suggested by Shepherd. Thus Claim 29 is not rendered unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Shepherd either. Claim 47 recites similar features as does Claim 29, and thus is also not rendered anticipated or unpatentable over Shepherd and Nakamura, either singly or in combination.

Claim 30 recites that the "the switching station selects, as the mobile station whose subscriber service information is to be deleted, a mobile station which has made neither call origination, call termination nor location registration for predetermined period of time, or a mobile station whose power state is off" (emphasis added) "in a case where no subscriber service information can be newly registered in the first management unit provided for use with the switching station".

The Office Action asserts that claim 30 does not have novelty over Nakamura by referring to column 4, lines 36-46, and column 7, lines 13-16 and 35-52 of Nakamura. However, in column 4, lines 36-46 of Nakamura, there is description that whether subscriber data is kept or not is decided based on priority, when the power down of the mobile station, or the completion of the call by the mobile station occurs. However, this is not the decision made at the time when there is no area for registration, and a mobile station whose subscriber service information is to be deleted is selected. As for column 7, lines 13-16 and 35-52 of Nakamura, there is only description that a mobile station whose subscriber data is to be replaced is selected based on whether the mobile station is on the phone or not (column 7, line 46-51).

Application No. 10/071,933  
Amendment "B" dated September 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed May 4, 2005

Therefore, Claim 30 is not anticipated by Nakamura. This feature is also not taught or suggested by Shepherd. Thus Claim 30 is not rendered unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Shepherd either. Claim 48 recites similar features as does Claim 30, and thus is also not rendered anticipated or unpatentable over Shepherd and Nakamura, either singly or in combination.

For at least these reasons, the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection should be withdrawn.

Section 3 of the Office Action rejects Claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Shepherd.

Claim 21 recites that "when the switching station deletes one of pieces of subscriber service information presently registered in the first management unit for use with the switching station, the switching station does not delete, from the first management unit for use with the switching station, subscriber location information about a mobile station corresponding to the subscriber service information to be deleted, and wherein when the switching station receives the location registration signal from the mobile station, the switching station registers in the second management unit the subscriber location information about the mobile station registered in the first management unit for use with the switching station".

Regarding claim 21, the Office Action asserts that although Nakamura does not disclose the switching station does not delete, from the first management unit for use with the switching station, subscriber location information about a mobile station corresponding to the subscriber service information to be deleted, since Shepherd et al. discloses keep track of all subscribers' location, the present invention of claim 21 is obvious over Nakamura and Shepherd.

However, Shepherd does not disclose a feature of the present invention of claim 21 that when the switching station receives the location registration signal from the mobile station

Application No. 10/071,933  
Amendment "B" dated September 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed May 4, 2005

(whose subscriber service information has been deleted, but whose subscriber location information has not been deleted), the switching station registers in the second management unit the subscriber location information about the mobile station registered in the first management unit for use with the switching station. Nakamura et al. also does not disclose this feature.

Thus, Claim 21 is not rendered unpatentable over even the combination of Nakamura and Shepherd.<sup>1</sup> Claim 41 recites similar features as does Claim 21, and thus is also not rendered unpatentable over even the combination of Nakamura and Shepherd. Claims 22 and 42 depend from Claims 21 and 41, respectively, and are thus not unpatentable over Nakamura and Shepherd at least for the reason provided for their corresponding independent claim.

Therefore, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection is also appropriate and requested. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of September, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



ADRIAN J. LEE  
Registration No. 42,785  
Attorney for Applicant  
Customer No. 022913

AJL:ds  
DS000000,9880V001

<sup>1</sup> Since even the combination does not disclose every feature of the claim, it is not necessary at this time for a complete response to address any arguments against combination. Accordingly, the lack of such arguments in this response does not mean that the Applicants acquiesce on that issue. The Applicants may make arguments against the combination should that become required by future Office Action.